



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/875,324	06/06/2001	Scott D. Guthrie	40062.98US01/MS160314.1	7515
27488	7590	01/05/2005	EXAMINER	
MICROSOFT CORPORATION C/O MERCHANT & GOULD, L.L.C. P.O. BOX 2903 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903			ZHONG, CHAD	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2152	

DATE MAILED: 01/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/875,324

Applicant(s)

GUTHRIE ET AL.

Examiner

Chad Zhong

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 June 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-58 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-58 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 09/875,324.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/29/03
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-58 are presented for examination.
2. Applicant is required to update the status (pending, allowed, etc.) of all parent priority applications in the first line of the specification. The status of all citations of US filed applications in the specification should also be updated where appropriate.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, second paragraph

3. Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
 - a. The claim language in the following claims is not clearly understood:
 - i. As per claim 33, line 1, it is not clearly understood what is meant by the method according to claim 34, does the Applicant mean claim 32?

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371 (c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

5. Claims 1-47, 50-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Craig et al. (hereinafter Craig), US 6,757,708.
6. As per claim 1, Craig teaches a method of providing remote computing services executed upon a

server having mass data storage and network communications to remote clients, the method comprising:

storing a source code file within the mass storage of the server (Fig 4, item 430; Col. 11, lines 20-35);

receiving a processing service request from a remote client corresponding to a requested

processing service specified within the source code file (Col. 9, lines 20-25);

activating a data processing object corresponding to the processing service requested from the remote client to generate a data response corresponding to the processing service request (Col. 9, lines 25-40);

formatting the data response into a data response packet (Col. 9, lines 20-40); and

transmitting the text passed data response packet to the remote client in response to the processing service request (Col. 9, lines 35-40),

wherein the data processing object corresponds to a compiled data processing class for the requested processing service contained within the source code file (Col. 9, lines 52-56).

7. As per claim 2, Craig teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein the server receives the processing service request having a packet payload body data block and transmits the text based data response packet using an HTTP communications protocol (Col. 9, lines 10-15).

8. As per claim 3, Craig teaches a method according to claim 2, wherein the source code file is stored within the mass storage of the server at a location corresponding to a URL for the processing service request (Fig 4).

9. As per claim 4, Craig teaches the method according to claim 2, wherein the activating step further comprises:

extracting from the packet payload body data block an ID corresponding to the requested processing service (the above limitation is inherent, the destination server must know the originating client in able to return results back to the client; further, Craig discloses this functionality in Col. 5, lines 10-20, wherein the input in the form of data packets coming in from the client side is used as identification key on the

cached objects on the server side);

extracting from the packet payload body data block one or more input arguments to be passed to the data processing object (Col. 2, lines 40-67; Col. 9, lines 20-50);

obtaining the data processing object corresponding to the requested processing service; and

causing the data processing object to generate the data response based upon the one or more input arguments (Col. 9, lines 35-56).

10. As per claim 5, Craig teaches the method according to claim 4, wherein the obtaining step further comprises:

determining whether the data processing object corresponding to the requested processing service is located within a web services library (Col. 10, lines 15-35);

determining whether any data processing object found within the web services library corresponds to the data processing object generated by compiling the data processing class for the requested processing service contained within the source code file (Col. 10, lines 15-35);

if the data processing object does not correspond to the data processing object generated by compiling the data processing class for the requested processing service contained within the source code file, automatically compiling the source code file to generate the data processing object for the requested processing service (Col. 12, lines 5-10).

11. As per claim 6, Craig teaches the method according to claim 5, wherein the obtaining step further comprises storing the data processing object within the web services library following the compilation of the source code file for use by subsequent processing service requests (Fig 4).

12. As per claim 7, Craig teaches the method according to claim 6, wherein the data processing object generates the data response based upon data retrieved from one or more remote databases specified by the

data processing the one or more input arguments (Fig 4; Col. 9, lines 35-40).

13. As per claim 8, Craig teaches the method according to claim 6, wherein the data processing object may activate and call one or more other data processing objects on the server (Col. 9, lines 20-25).

14. As per claim 9, Craig teaches the method according to claim 8, wherein the one or more data processing objects correspond to compiled data processing classes contained within source code files which are not the same as the source code file for the data processing class (Col. 9, lines 50-57).

15. As per claim 10, Craig teaches the method according to claim 9, wherein the one or more data processing objects are dynamically created whenever the one or more data processing objects stored within the web services library do not correspond to a compiled version of the appropriate data processing classes (Col. 10, lines 15-35).

16. As per claims 11-20, claims 11-20 are rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claims 1-10 above respectively.

17. As per claims 21-30, claims 21-30 are rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claim 1-10 above respectively.

18. As per claim 31, claim 31 is rejected for the same reasons as rejection to combination of claims 1, 4, 9 and 10 above.

19. As per claims 32-34, claims 32-34 are rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claims 6-9 above respectively.

20. As per claim 35, claim 35 is rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claim 9 above.

21. As per claim 36-39, claims 36-39 are rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claims 31, 6-9

above respectively.

22. As per claim 40, claim 40 is rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claim 9 above.

23. As per claim 41-42, claims 41-42 are rejected for the same reason as rejection to claims 1, 6 above respectively.

24. As per claim 43, Craig teaches the method according to claim 42, wherein data exchange schema data comprises an HTML representation for a web page containing a description of exposed data processing services (Col. 10, lines 55-60).

25. As per claim 44, Craig teaches the method according to claim 43, wherein the web page comprises:

- a textual description of each exposed data processing service based upon data stored within the source code file (Col. 10, lines 55-65);

- a description of each input argument accepted by each exposed data processing service, the description includes a description of the input argument and a description of the data format for the input argument data expected by the exposed data processing service (Col. 10, lines 5-15; wherein input description are in the forms of JSP/beans/tags); and

- a description of each output data value generated by each exposed data processing service (Col. 9, lines 25-40).

26. As per claim 45, Craig teaches the method according to claim 44, wherein the description of each input argument further comprises an input field upon the generated web page for permitting a user to input a value to be passed to the exposed data processing service as the corresponding input argument (Col. 9, lines 20-40).

27. As per claim 46, Craig teaches the method according to claim 45, wherein the description of each

output data value generated by each exposed data processing service further comprises an activate button which causes the remote data processing service to be activated using the values contained within the, input fields corresponding to the input arguments as the input arguments submitted with the remote data processing service request (Col. 9, lines 20-40).

28. As per claim 47, Craig teaches the method according to claim 42, data exchange schema data comprises a specification for the input and output data schema expressed in a data transfer specification language (Col. 9, lines 20-40).

29. As per claims 50-56, claim 50-56 are rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claim 1, 6, 43-47 above respectively.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

30. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

31. Claims 48 and 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Craig et

al. (hereinafter Craig), US 6,757,708, in view of 'Web Services Description Language', Curbera et al., March, 2001 (hereinafter Curbera).

32. As per claim 48, Craig does not explicitly teach the method according to claim 47, wherein the data transfer specification language comprises a Web Services Description Language representation for the data exchange schema data.

33. Curbera teaches:

data transfer specification language comprises a Web Services Description Language representation for the data exchange schema data.

34. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention was made to combine the teaching of Craig and Curbera because they both dealing with XML language extensions.

Furthermore, the teaching of Curbera to allow

data transfer specification language comprises a Web Services Description Language representation for the data exchange schema data.

would provide for flexibility of communications (as shown by example Col. 10, lines 55-60 of Craig, where as anyone of a plurality of web services languages can be utilized to perform data exchange schema) between the end nodes of the network wherein WSDL allows description of endpoints and their messages regardless of what message formats or network protocols are used to communicate.

35. As per claim 57, claim 57 is rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claim 48 above.

36. Claims 49 and 58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Craig et al. (hereinafter Craig), US 6,757,708, in view of "Metadata Activity Statement", February 2001, (hereinafter Meta).

37. As per claim 49, Craig does not teach the method according to claim 47, wherein the data transfer specification language comprises a Resource Description Format representation for the data exchange schema data.

38. Meta teaches the data transfer specification language comprises a Resource Description Format representation for the data exchange schema data (pg 2, lines 8-14).

39. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention was made to combine the teaching of Craig and Meta because they both dealing with XML language extensions.

Furthermore, the teaching of Meta to allow

the data transfer specification language comprises a Resource Description Format representation for the data exchange schema data

would provide for compatibility of communications (as shown by example Col. 10, lines 55-60 of Craig, where as anyone of a plurality of web services languages can be utilized to perform data exchange schema) between the end nodes of the network wherein different websites can easily share information with each other utilizing RDF framework.

40. As per claim 58, claim 58 is rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claim 49 above.

Conclusion

41. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The following patents and publications are cited to further show the state of the art with respect to

"PROVIDING REMOTE PROCESSING SERVICES OVER A DISTRIBUTED COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK".

i. US 6542908 IMS.

ii. "Server Side Java", Kaffe, Jan 16, 1998

iii. "Java Script Language - Chapter 1 Introduction", Netscape Communications, April 23, 2001

iv. "Microsoft Professional Developers Conference Summary", Tuecke, 1996

v. "XML RPC Specification", Dave Winer, June 15, 1999


Art Unit: 2152

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chad Zhong whose telephone number is (571)272-3946. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:15 to 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, BURGESS, GLENTON B can be reached on (571)272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

CZ
November 1, 2004


GLENTON B. BURGESS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100
12/2/04